APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,823	04/28/2006	Michael W. Trainum	1041006	2840

7590   12/19/2008

Michael Haynes
1341 Huntersfield Close
Keswick, VA 22947

EXAMINER
HOANG, SON T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/577,823	TRAINUM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SON T. HOANG	2165	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 October 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 April 2006</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This communication is in response to the amendment filed on October 14, 2008.

         Claims 1-10, **23**, **29-30**, **36**, **39**, and **47-48** have been amended.

         Claims 1-48 are pending in this instant Office action.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's argument with respect to **independent claims 1**, **23**, and **36**,

regarding the fact that Schneid, as modified by Stefik, does not disclose a study guide

which is a subset of the source document supported by a structure of the source

document but having different objects than the source document; and automatically

reorder the study guide responsive to a reordering of the source document.

         The Examiner concurs to the above remarks. However, it is noted that, Berg et

al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed on May 31, 2001; hereinafter Berg*) teaches the

newly added limitations. Accordingly, Berg discloses:

         a study guide which is a subset of the source document supported by a structure

of the source document but having different objects than the source document (*Figure*

1A shows the source XML DOM document has a subset document model 12 which has

the same structure but different objects compare to the source XML DOM, [0031]); and

         automatically reorder the study guide responsive to a reordering of the source

document (*Each adapter registers with the DOM node and MOF object, respectively, to*

be notified when changes are made to the DOM node(s) or MOF property(ies) for which

it is responsible. During the process of editing, whether editing the MOF object on the

display side or editing the DOM node on the source side, when a change is made, the

corresponding adapter, upon notification, reflects the change to the corresponding MOF

object or DOM node, respectively, [0034]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of

the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of <u>Berg</u> with the teachings of

<u>Schneid</u>, as modified by <u>Stefik</u>, for the purpose of synchronizing a document object

model (DOM) of an XML document with its object model in real time ([0001] of <u>Berg</u>).

In view of the above, the Examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the

claims have been addressed in this Action. Hence, Applicant's arguments do not

distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

For the above reasons, the Examiner believes that rejection of this instant Office

action is proper.

Claim Objections

3.   **Claims 1, 23**, and **36** are objected to because of the following informalities:

grammatical errors in citing "*define a study guide, <u>the study guide a subset</u> of the*

source document..."

Claim 5 is objected due to having an obscured phrase "*the object one of the*

plurality of objects" on lines 5-6.

Claim 6 is objected due to having an obscured limitations of "*an identity of a shell*

originator of the source document stored in the database <u>and copied</u> to properties of

each of the multiple documents, an identify of an edition author of the source document

not copied to properties of each of the multiple documents."

   Claim 9 is objected due to having an obscured phrase "*by attribute security*

level."

   Claim 10 is objected due to having an obscured phrase "*cannot omit security*

level." The Examiner suggests changing the above phrase to "*cannot-omit security*

level."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
> and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the

various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were

made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under

37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not

commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. **Claims 1-5, , and 13-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over <u>Schneid</u> (*Pub. No. US 2002/107883, published on August 8, 2002*)

in view of <u>Stefik et al.</u> (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002;*

hereinafter <u>Stefik</u>), and further in view of <u>Berg et al.</u> (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed*

on May 31, 2001; hereinafter <u>Berg</u>).

Regarding **claim 1**, <u>Schneid</u> clearly shows and discloses a system comprising a

memory device storing instructions, executable by an information device (*Figure 2*), said

instructions adapted to automatically manage:

an object-oriented database storing a plurality of objects (*Figure 4 shows a*

database with multiple templates along with a plurality of objects); and

a computer-based document management module (*Component Object Modules,*

[0033]) adapted to:

create a source document comprising the plurality of objects (*Figure 9 shows the*

conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format, [0039]. It is

clearly shown that the intermediate live file is the source document, i.e. template); and

automatically and individually control a content, a plurality of content attributes

(*Document and data list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414, privileges object*

415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various versions of the

document, [0035]), a usage permission (*a printer may be allowed read-only access,*

[0041]), and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple

documents (*access privileges can be determined that each user may assert over each*

element of a brochure, [0041]. When only those with authorized privileges can access

each of the derived elements, the distribution is clearly for non-public users) derived

from the source document (*It is shown clearly that localized versions of a document are derived from an original/source version of the document, i.e. the intermediate live file or template*, [0035]).

Schneid does not explicitly disclose that the distribution permission comprising a non-commercial permission.

Stefik discloses distribution permission comprising a non-commercial permission (*when a creator creates a digital work, he grants an Embed right and a Copy right, both of which require the distribution license to be exercised. He grants a Play right so that the work can be played by anyone. He may optionally add a Transfer or Loan right, so that end consumers can do some non-commercial exchange of the work among friends*, [0353]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Stefik with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of permitting the owner or other authorized party to specify a manner of use of the content and to associate the manner of use with the content in a persistent way using a set of rights associated with a composite of digital work ([0015] of Stefik).

Schneid, as modified by Stefik, does not disclose a study guide which is a subset of the source document supported by a structure of the source document but having different objects than the source document; and automatically reorder the study guide responsive to a reordering of the source document.

However, <u>Berg</u> discloses:

a study guide which is a subset of the source document supported by a structure
of the source document but having different objects than the source document (*Figure
1A shows the source XML DOM document has a subset document model 12 which has
the same structure but different objects compare to the source XML DOM*, [0031]); and

automatically reorder the study guide responsive to a reordering of the source
document (*Each adapter registers with the DOM node and MOF object, respectively, to
be notified when changes are made to the DOM node(s) or MOF property(ies) for which
it is responsible. During the process of editing, whether editing the MOF object on the
display side or editing the DOM node on the source side, when a change is made, the
corresponding adapter, upon notification, reflects the change to the corresponding MOF
object or DOM node, respectively*, [0034]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of <u>Berg</u> with the teachings of
<u>Schneid</u>, as modified by <u>Stefik</u>, for the purpose of synchronizing a document object
model (DOM) of an XML document with its object model in real time ([0001] of <u>Berg</u>).

Regarding **claim 2**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a system, wherein said document
management module is further adapted to define a content, a plurality of content
attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of
objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges
for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office*

would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective

localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only

access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels.

Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as

whether it be text or graphic, [0041]); and

Stefik discloses the source document having formatted audio and video content

(*"digital work" refers to any work that has been reduced to a digital representation. This*

would include any audio, video, text, or multimedia work and any accompanying

interpreter (e.g. software) that may be required for recreating or rendering the content of

the work, [0038]).

Regarding **claim 3**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document

management module is further adapted to prevent modification of a content, a plurality

of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the

plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write*

privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local

office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the

respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed

read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain

privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular

element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]). and

Stefik discloses applying object level security to a picture object such that when the picture object is copied to a new version of the source document, security properties associated with picture object are copied into the new version of the source document (*Usage rights are permanently associated with the digital work. Copies made of a digital work will also have the associated usage rights. Thus, the usage rights and any associated fees assigned by a creator and subsequent distributor will always remain with a digital work*, [0039]).

Regarding **claim 4**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to publish the source document (*the system coordinates live content file conversion into an output format and delivers to an output provider*, [0010]).

Regarding **claim 5**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to generate a derived document from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document*, [0020]).

Stefik discloses applying security permissions of an object to metadata of the object when the object is copied from the source document to a new version of the source document, the object one of the plurality of objects (*Usage rights are permanently associated with the digital work. Copies made of a digital work will also have the associated usage rights. Thus, the usage rights and any associated fees*

assigned by a creator and subsequent distributor will always remain with a digital work,
[0039]).

Regarding **claim 13**, <u>Berg</u> further discloses:

generate an auxiliary document from the source document, the auxiliary
document reflecting at least a portion of a structure of the source document, at least a
portion of a content of the auxiliary document differing from a content of the source
document (*Figure 1A shows the source XML DOM document has a subset document
model 12 which has the same structure but different objects compare to the source XML
DOM*, [0031]); and

automatically change the auxiliary document responsive to a corresponding
change in the source document (*Each adapter registers with the DOM node and MOF
object, respectively, to be notified when changes are made to the DOM node(s) or MOF
property(ies) for which it is responsible. During the process of editing, whether editing
the MOF object on the display side or editing the DOM node on the source side, when a
change is made, the corresponding adapter, upon notification, reflects the change to the
corresponding MOF object or DOM node, respectively*, [0034]).

Regarding **claim 14**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a system, wherein each of the
plurality of objects of the multiple documents is stored only once in said database (*DTP
conversion 430 sends a native DTP file to Application Server 400 where Import
Conversion Templates and Logic 440 operate on the Templates object 411 for each
converted file*, [0030]).

Regarding **claim 15**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises content formatting information (*The Import content logic 450 sends content such as JPG and EPS formatted content objects to the images object 412 and other data objects in TTF or Type 1 format to Fonts object 413,* [0030]).

Regarding **claim 16**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises content type information (*The conversion processor scans the native file 920 to detect each object 950 thereof and for each object 950, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein,* [0039]).

Regarding **claim 17**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises document structure information (*a design object 952 is parsed with location and format information and the interrelationships of each of the objects 950 and 952 are determined and stored in an object interrelation object 954. Similarly permissions object 953 may begin with standard permissions from a DTD or may be added by work flow clients,* [0039]).

Regarding **claim 18**, <u>Stefik</u> further discloses the plurality of content attributes comprises content creator information (*creator creates a digital work, step 101. The creator will then determine appropriate usage rights and fees, associate them with the digital work, and store them in Repository 1, step 102,* [0041]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of <u>Jones</u> with the teachings of <u>Schneid</u>, as modified by <u>Stefik</u>, for the purpose of enabling digital asset management to reliably link

media content with additional data about the content using watermarks ([0008] of

Jones).

Regarding **claim 19**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of

objects of the source document comprises a text object (*the permission may be based*

on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 20**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of

objects of the source document comprises a graphical object (*the permission may be*

based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic,

[0041]).

Regarding **claim 21**, Stefik further discloses the plurality of objects of the source

document comprises an audio object (*"digital work" refers to any work that has been*

reduced to a digital representation. This would include any audio, video, text, or

multimedia work and any accompanying interpreter (e.g. software) that may be required

for recreating or rendering the content of the work, [0038]).

Regarding **claim 22**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of

objects of the source document comprises a video object ([0049]).

Regarding **claim 23**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a method (*Figure 3*),

comprising a plurality of activities comprising:

via a computer-based document management module ([0033]):

creating a source document comprising a plurality of objects, each of said

plurality of objects stored in a database (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a*

native file to the Intermediate Live file format. The conversion processor scans the

native file to detect each object thereof and for each object, a content object is parsed

and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]. *It is clearly shown*

that the intermediate live file is the source document, i.e. template); and

automatically and individually controlling a content, a plurality of content

attributes (*Document and data list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414,*

privileges object 415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various

versions of the document, [0035]), a usage permission (*a printer may be allowed read-*

only access, [0041]), and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in

each of multiple documents (*access privileges can be determined that each user may*

assert over each element of a brochure, [0041]. *When only those with authorized*

privileges can access each of the derived elements, the distribution is clearly for non-

public users) derived from the source document (*It is shown clearly that localized*

versions of a document are derived from an original/source version of the document, i.e.

the intermediate live file or template, [0035]).

Schneid does not explicitly disclose that the distribution permission comprising a

non-commercial permission.

However, Stefik discloses distribution permission comprising a non-commercial

permission (*when a creator creates a digital work, he grants an Embed right and a Copy*

right, both of which require the distribution license to be exercised. He grants a Play

right so that the work can be played by anyone. He may optionally add a Transfer or

Loan right, so that end consumers can do some non-commercial exchange of the work

among friends, [0353]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of

the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of <u>Stefik</u> with the teachings of

<u>Schneid</u> for the purpose of permitting the owner or other authorized party to specify a

manner of use of the content and to associate the manner of use with the content in a

persistent way using a set of rights associated with a composite of digital work ([0015]

of <u>Stefik</u>).

<u>Schneid</u>, as modified by <u>Stefik</u>, does not disclose a study guide which is a subset

of the source document supported by a structure of the source document but having

different objects than the source document; and automatically reorder the study guide

responsive to a reordering of the source document.

However, <u>Berg</u> discloses:

a study guide which is a subset of the source document supported by a structure

of the source document but having different objects than the source document (*Figure*

1A shows the source XML DOM document has a subset document model 12 which has

the same structure but different objects compare to the source XML DOM, [0031]); and

automatically reorder the study guide responsive to a reordering of the source

document (*Each adapter registers with the DOM node and MOF object, respectively, to*

be notified when changes are made to the DOM node(s) or MOF property(ies) for which

it is responsible. During the process of editing, whether editing the MOF object on the

display side or editing the DOM node on the source side, when a change is made, the

corresponding adapter, upon notification, reflects the change to the corresponding MOF

object or DOM node, respectively, [0034]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of

the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Berg with the teachings of

Schneid, as modified by Stefik, for the purpose of synchronizing a document object

model (DOM) of an XML document with its object model in real time ([0001] of Berg).

Regarding **claim 24**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising

defining a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a

distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there*

may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular

visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the

entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure.

Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong

to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based

on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 25**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising

preventing modification of a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage

permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source

document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic,* [0041]).

Regarding **claim 26**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a method, further comprising publishing the source document (*the system coordinates live content file conversion into an output format and delivers to an output provider,* [0010]).

Regarding **claim 27**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a method, further comprising generating a derived document from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document,* [0020]).

Regarding **claim 28**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a method, further comprising deriving each of the multiple documents from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document,* [0020]).

Regarding **claim 29**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a method, further comprising propagating a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission of the source document to each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 8 shows the output logic flow. Output logic 800 utilizes Templates object 411, images object 412, Fonts object 413, data lists object 414, Privileges object 415, Approvers object 417 and documents object 420 to produce Output for proofs or final output, preferably in Postscript, Portable Document format or XML. The output functions are preferably controlled using a Java interface to a work flow client,* [0037]).

Regarding **claim 30**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a method, further comprising preventing modification of a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission in each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic,* [0041]).

Regarding **claim 31**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a method, further comprising determining an identity of the source document from each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 7 shows the comment logic flow of this*

exemplary embodiment. Comment logic 700 utilizes privileges object 415 to operate on

comment subject 416 and documents object 420. Comments and versions are tracked

for each document, each object of the document and for each version by user. The

comment functions are preferably executed using a Java interface to a work flow client,

[0037]).

Regarding **claim 32**, <u>Berg</u> further discloses performing a bi-directional

comparison of the source document and a derivative document derived from the source

document (*Each adapter registers with the DOM node and MOF object, respectively, to*

be notified when changes are made to the DOM node(s) or MOF property(ies) for which

it is responsible. During the process of editing, whether editing the MOF object on the

display side or editing the DOM node on the source side, when a change is made, the

corresponding adapter, upon notification, reflects the change to the corresponding MOF

object or DOM node, respectively, [0034]).

Regarding **claim 33**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a method, further comprising

searching across the source document and each document derived from the source

document (*Different translations may be manually or automatically applied to sections*

or objects of the content, [0035]).

Regarding **claim 34**, <u>Berg</u> further discloses:

generate an auxiliary document from the source document, the auxiliary

document reflecting at least a portion of a structure of the source document, at least a

portion of a content of the auxiliary document differing from a content of the source

document (*Figure 1A shows the source XML DOM document has a subset document model 12 which has the same structure but different objects compare to the source XML DOM,* [0031]).

Regarding **claim 35**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a method, wherein each of the plurality of objects of the multiple documents is stored only once in said database (*DTP conversion 430 sends a native DTP file to Application Server 400 where Import Conversion Templates and Logic 440 operate on the Templates object 411 for each converted file,* [0030]).

Regarding **claim 36**, <u>Schneid</u> clearly shows and discloses a machine readable medium storing instructions executable by an information device, for activities ([Column 4, Claim 16]) comprising:

creating a source document comprising a plurality of objects, each of said plurality of objects stored in a database (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format. The conversion processor scans the native file to detect each object thereof and for each object, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein,* [0039]. *It is clearly shown that the intermediate live file is the source document, i.e. template*); and

automatically and individually controlling a content, a plurality of content attributes (*Document and data list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414, privileges object 415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various versions of the document,* [0035]), a usage permission (*a printer may be allowed read-*

only access, [0041]), and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in

each of multiple documents (*access privileges can be determined that each user may*

assert over each element of a brochure, [0041]. *When only those with authorized*

privileges can access each of the derived elements, the distribution is clearly for non-

public users) derived from the source document (*It is shown clearly that localized*

versions of a document are derived from an original/source version of the document, i.e.

the intermediate live file or template, [0035]).

Schneid does not explicitly disclose that the distribution permission comprising a

non-commercial permission.

However, Stefik discloses distribution permission comprising a non-commercial

permission (*when a creator creates a digital work, he grants an Embed right and a Copy*

right, both of which require the distribution license to be exercised. He grants a Play

right so that the work can be played by anyone. He may optionally add a Transfer or

Loan right, so that end consumers can do some non-commercial exchange of the work

among friends, [0353]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of

the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Stefik with the teachings of

Schneid for the purpose of permitting the owner or other authorized party to specify a

manner of use of the content and to associate the manner of use with the content in a

persistent way using a set of rights associated with a composite of digital work ([0015]

of Stefik).

Schneid, as modified by Stefik, does not disclose a study guide which is a subset of the source document supported by a structure of the source document but having different objects than the source document; and automatically reorder the study guide responsive to a reordering of the source document.

However, Berg discloses:

a study guide which is a subset of the source document supported by a structure of the source document but having different objects than the source document (*Figure 1A shows the source XML DOM document has a subset document model 12 which has the same structure but different objects compare to the source XML DOM*, [0031]); and

automatically reorder the study guide responsive to a reordering of the source document (*Each adapter registers with the DOM node and MOF object, respectively, to be notified when changes are made to the DOM node(s) or MOF property(ies) for which it is responsible. During the process of editing, whether editing the MOF object on the display side or editing the DOM node on the source side, when a change is made, the corresponding adapter, upon notification, reflects the change to the corresponding MOF object or DOM node, respectively*, [0034]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Berg with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik, for the purpose of synchronizing a document object model (DOM) of an XML document with its object model in real time ([0001] of Berg).

7.   **Claims 6**, **8-10**, **38**, **41**, and **46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over <u>Schneid</u> (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*)

in view of <u>Stefik et al.</u> (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002;*

hereinafter <u>Stefik</u>), and further in view of <u>Berg et al.</u> (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed*

on May 31, 2001; hereinafter <u>Berg</u>), and further in view of <u>Erickson</u> (*Pat. No. US*

6,807,534, filed on May 31, 2000).

Regarding **claim 6**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a document management module

is further adapted to derive each of the multiple documents from the source document

(*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g.,*

permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof

and output ready versions of the document, [0020]).

<u>Stefik</u> discloses copying all object level security properties of the source

document to each of the multiple documents (*Usage rights are permanently associated*

with the digital work. Copies made of a digital work will also have the associated usage

rights. Thus, the usage rights and any associated fees assigned by a creator and

subsequent distributor will always remain with a digital work, [0039]).

<u>Schneid</u>, as modified by <u>Stefik</u> and <u>Berg</u>, does not disclose an identity of a shell

originator of the source document stored in the database and copied to properties of

each of the multiple documents, an identify of an edition author of the source document

not copied to properties of each of the multiple documents.

However, Erickson discloses an identity of a shell originator of the source document stored in the database and copied to properties of each of the multiple documents, an identify of an edition author of the source document not copied to properties of each of the multiple documents (*Authors can require that their work is included as a source works extension in a derivative work, or they can leave this choice to the editor or derivative developer. Authors can also request that their source works are not displayed*, [Column 12, Lines 34-44]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Erickson with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Berg, for the purpose of providing on-line licensing and copyright management for electronic media through a secure electronic format and registration ([Abstract] of Erickson).

Regarding **claim 8**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to prevent modification of a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission in each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic*, [0041]).

Erickson further discloses defining a public domain security level for an object, the public domain security level indicative that a creator of the object has given up all rights to content of the object (*certain minimum permissions to a widely-distributed version of the media packaged as a DOCUMENT, thus being generally usable for free personal use. The DOCUMENT creator or author determines these minimum permissions in the spirit of fair use*, [Column 4, Lines 43-52]).

Regarding **claim 9**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to determine an identity of the source document from each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 7 shows the comment logic flow of this exemplary embodiment. Comment logic 700 utilizes privileges object 415 to operate on comment subject 416 and documents object 420. Comments and versions are tracked for each document, each object of the document and for each version by user. The comment functions are preferably executed using a Java interface to a work flow client*, [0037]).

Erickson further discloses:

defining a by attribution security level for an edition of the source document, the by attribution security level indicative that a creator of the edition has given up all rights to content of the edition (*certain minimum permissions to a widely-distributed version of the media packaged as a DOCUMENT, thus being generally usable for free personal use. The DOCUMENT creator or author determines these minimum permissions in the spirit of fair use*, [Column 4, Lines 43-52]), but the source document retains original

credits of the creator at an edition level; and not allow users of derivative versions of the

source document to change credit attributes protected by the by attribution security level

(*the licensing is provided to creators of derivative media works, i.e., those who modify*

an original work of authorship and who obtain authorization to do so through an

augmentation in the permissions data set. The modified DOCUMENT is then registered

on a registration server and licensed through an authorization server. The DOCUMENT

in this aspect preferably includes a sourceworks extension module which records the

original and derivative authorship of the media. By retaining such information, a

copyright "family tree" or electronic bibliographic record is maintained for the media,

([Column 3, Line 61 – Column 4, Line 7]).

Regarding **claim 10**, <u>Erickson</u> further discloses a cannot omit security level for an

object, the cannot omit security level indicative that a creator of the object Is enforcing a

right to require inclusion of one or more objects in a derivative version of the source

document and to retain credits for the one or more objects (*the licensing is provided to*

creators of derivative media works, i.e., those who modify an original work of authorship

and who obtain authorization to do so through an augmentation in the permissions data

set. The modified DOCUMENT is then registered on a registration server and licensed

through an authorization server. The DOCUMENT in this aspect preferably includes a

sourceworks extension module which records the original and derivative authorship of

the media. By retaining such information, a copyright "family tree" or electronic

bibliographic record is maintained for the media, ([Column 3, Line 61 – Column 4, Line

7]).

Regarding **claim 38**, <u>Erickson</u> further discloses allowing enforcement of instructions provided by an owner of the source document regarding legal use of the source document, the computer-based document management module adapted to allow security properties to be modified to a setting in each of the multiple documents that is more restrictive than the instructions provided by the owner (*the licensing is provided to creators of derivative media works, i.e., those who modify an original work of authorship and who obtain authorization to do so through an augmentation in the permissions data set. The modified DOCUMENT is then registered on a registration server and licensed through an authorization server. The DOCUMENT in this aspect preferably includes a sourceworks extension module which records the original and derivative authorship of the media. By retaining such information, a copyright "family tree" or electronic bibliographic record is maintained for the media*, ([Column 3, Line 61 – Column 4, Line 7]).

Regarding **claim 41**, <u>Erickson</u> further discloses responsive to a selection by an owner of the source document, remove all rights of the owner regarding the source document but retain all original credits at an edition or object level of the source document (*A record of the media source works is also available through the VIEWER. The sourceworks extensions provide a bibliography of the authors of the media so that the appropriate authors are credited with their works even after the works are edited by a derivative author. The sourceworks extensions are typically available within a display-- sometimes denoted herein as the "Source Works Display"-- at the user's computer terminal*, [Column 6, Lines 8-16]).

Regarding **claim 46**, <u>Erickson</u> further discloses wherein the usage permission comprises a by attribution security level, the by attribution security level adapted to build upon the source document without additional permissions so long as original credits remain in a new edition based upon the source document, the by attribution security level unchangeable by a user, the by attribution security level automatically copied to derivative versions of the source document, the by attribution security level not user changeable in the derivative versions of the source document (*the licensing is provided to creators of derivative media works, i.e., those who modify an original work of authorship and who obtain authorization to do so through an augmentation in the permissions data set. The modified DOCUMENT is then registered on a registration server and licensed through an authorization server. The DOCUMENT in this aspect preferably includes a sourceworks extension module which records the original and derivative authorship of the media. By retaining such information, a copyright "family tree" or electronic bibliographic record is maintained for the media*, ([Column 3, Line 61 – Column 4, Line 7]).

8.   **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Schneid</u> (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of <u>Stefik et al.</u> (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter <u>Stefik</u>*), and further in view of <u>Berg et al.</u> (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed on May 31, 2001; hereinafter <u>Berg</u>*), and further in view of <u>Colas et al.</u> (*Pat. No. US 2003/0046152, filed on August 22, 2001; hereinafter <u>Colas</u>*).

Regarding **claim 7**, <u>Schneid</u> further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to propagate a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission of the source document to each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 8 shows the output logic flow. Output logic 800 utilizes Templates object 411, images object 412, Fonts object 413, data lists object 414, Privileges object 415, Approvers object 417 and documents object 420 to produce Output for proofs or final output, preferably in Postscript, Portable Document format or XML. The output functions are preferably controlled using a Java interface to a work flow client*, [0037]).

<u>Stefik</u> discloses allow a single owner of each object to change security properties for the object at any time up until a publishing event (*a magazine has various articles and photographs which may have been created and are owned by different persons. Each of the articles and photographs may represent a node in a hierarchical structure. Consequently, controls, i.e. usage rights, may be placed on each node by the creator*, [0051]).

<u>Schneid</u>, as modified by <u>Stefik</u> and <u>Berg</u>, does not disclose locking security properties for all objects of the source document responsive to the publishing event.

<u>Colas</u> discloses locking security properties for all objects of the source document responsive to the publishing event (*After the laid out Ad Master has been sent to the Publisher, it will be LOCKED, meaning that it cannot be edited or deleted. The Ad Box will be available for editing and deletion after the Ad Master is sent to print*, 0129]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Colas with the teachings of

Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Berg, for the purpose of providing an efficient and

less error-prone system and process for implementing and managing the life-cycle

stages of ads appearing in print, electronic and other media ([0014] of Colas).

9.   **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid

(*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub.*

No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik), and further in

view of Berg et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed on May 31, 2001; hereinafter*

Berg), and further in view of Hallett et al. (*Pub. No. US 2004/0216033, filed on April 23,*

2003; hereinafter Hallett).

Regarding **claim 11**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Berg, does not

performing a bi-directional comparison of a first derivative document derived from the

source document and a second derivative document derived from the source document.

However, Hallett discloses performing a bi-directional comparison of a first

derivative document derived from the source document and a second derivative

document derived from the source document (*Figures 5A & 5B show checking for errors*

in derived documents compared to the source document, [0037]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Hallett with the teachings of Schneid, as

modified by Stefik and Berg, for the purpose of reducing or eliminating the error in

validating document data by comparing data blocks of the derived document with data blocks of the source document ([0003] and [Abstract] of Hallett).

10.   **Claims 12** and **44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*), and further in view of Berg et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed on May 31, 2001; hereinafter Berg*), and further in view of Flores et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,370,498, published on April 9, 2002; hereinafter Flores*).

Regarding **claim 12**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Berg, does not disclose a module adapted to language-independently search the database, and return search results in multiple languages even though search parameters are entered in a single language.

Flores discloses a module adapted to language-independently search the database, and return search results in multiple languages even though search parameters are entered in a single language (*The user will first select a particular work to view, generally chosen from a provided menu listing the works available on the database. Typically, once a work is selected, the user will be provided with a list of languages that the work is available in. For example, a user might choose the Shakespearean play of Hamlet and indicate that the languages the user would like to read the play in are Japanese and Portuguese. The software accesses the database, retrieving and then displaying for the user's view translations of Hamlet in both Japanese and Portuguese, [Column 6, Lines 28-42]*).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Flores with the teachings of

Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Berg, for the purpose of providing a searching

system that is beneficial for mono-lingual and/or multi-lingual users in researching by

retrieving and displaying a particular work in multiple languages ([Column 3, Lines 46-

52] of Flores).

Regarding **claim 44**, Flores further discloses responsive to entry of one or more

search terms by a user, perform a database query, the query adapted to return to the

user a search result in a different language from that of the one or more search terms

(*For example, a user might choose the Shakespearean play of Hamlet and indicate that*

the languages the user would like to read the play in are Japanese and Portuguese.

The software accesses the database, retrieving and then displaying for the user's view

translations of Hamlet in both Japanese and Portuguese, [Column 6, Lines 28-42]).

11.   **Claim 37** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid

(*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub.*

No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik), and further in

view of Berg et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed on May 31, 2001; hereinafter*

Berg), and further in view of Flores et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,370,498, published on April 9,*

2002; hereinafter Flores), and further in view of Drucker et al. (*Pub. No. US*

2004/0215657, filed on April 22, 2003, hereinafter Drucker).

Regarding **claim 37**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Berg, does not disclose

allowing a user to search for a user-selected topic in each of the multiple documents

and in the source document regardless of differences in language between the source document and at least one of the multiple documents, and returning all editions of the multiple documents having a same shell identifier number as a found document that comprises the user-selected topic.

However, <u>Flores</u> discloses allowing a user to search for a user-selected topic in each of the multiple documents and in the source document regardless of differences in language between the source document and at least one of the multiple documents (*The user will first select a particular work to view, generally chosen from a provided menu listing the works available on the database. Typically, once a work is selected, the user will be provided with a list of languages that the work is available in. For example, a user might choose the Shakespearean play of Hamlet and indicate that the languages the user would like to read the play in are Japanese and Portuguese. The software accesses the database, retrieving and then displaying for the user's view translations of Hamlet in both Japanese and Portuguese*, [Column 6, Lines 28-42]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of <u>Flores</u> with the teachings of <u>Schneid</u>, as modified by <u>Stefik</u> and <u>Berg</u>, for the purpose of providing a searching system that is beneficial for mono-lingual and/or multi-lingual users in researching by retrieving and displaying a particular work in multiple languages ([Column 3, Lines 46-52] of <u>Flores</u>).

Schneid, as modified by Stefik, Berg, and Flores, does not disclose returning all editions of the multiple documents having a same shell identifier number as a found document that comprises the user-selected topic.

However, Drucker discloses returning all editions of the multiple documents having a same shell identifier number as a found document that comprises the user-selected topic (*when a user would like to find a particular book title written by Stephen King or one of his other pseudonyms published in the 1990's but does not know the title of the book, the author, and/or the year it was published, a user can enter one or more non-specific search terms in order to retrieve an object somewhat related to or in the neighborhood of the desired object (e.g., book cover/title). Thus, at 320, a cover of a book entitled "The Stand" published in 1990 and authored by Stephen King is centrally displayed to the user. At 330, a plurality of additional objects (e.g., book titles, movies, websites, news articles, etc.) having respective metadata associated therewith. The respective metadata of the additional objects are at least in part related to the metadata associated with "The Stand" are displayed peripheral to "The Stand" book cover,* [0043]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Drucker with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik, Berg, and Flores, for the purpose of accessing and browsing objects in which a user begins with a center object (e.g., one or a few focal objects) displayed on a screen and related objects are populated on the screen as well. The related objects can be further organized into clusters whereby each cluster or

grouping of objects expands on a particular attribute of the center object, ([Abstract] of

Drucker).

12.   **Claims 39-40**, **42**, and **45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*)

in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002;*

hereinafter Stefik), and further in view of Berg et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed*

on May 31, 2001; hereinafter Berg), and further in view of Ainsbury et al. (*Pat. No. US*

6,078,924, published on June 20, 2000; hereinafter Ainsbury).

Regarding **claim 39**, Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Berg, does not disclose

providing users of the source document with contact information of the owner for each

of the plurality of objects of the source document.

However, Ainsbury discloses providing users of the source document with

contact information of the owner for each of the plurality of objects of the source

document (*the Case Items are displayed in a list with each items' associated properties.*

Table 13 shows the property 'Author' which indicates user who set the collection item or

added the information item, [Column 32, Lines 20-59]). *Table 13 also discloses the*

'Owner' property which indicates the user name of current Case owner, [Column 30,

Lines 13-34]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ainsbury with the teachings of

Schneid , as modified by Stefik and Berg, for the purpose of providing a user with a

market understanding necessary to execute rapid and knowledgeable decision making

by organizing the library of information and providing analysis using multiple content-types ([Abstract] of <u>Ainsbury</u>).

Regarding **claim 40**, <u>Ainsbury</u> further discloses responsive to publication of the source document, lock all of the plurality of objects of the source document (*If the user creates a template from a Case, they are informed that the collection criteria for the Case Items and Search Items are cleared when the Case is saved as a template. The Case is saved as a template and the original Case is retained*, [Column 40, Lines 46-50]), and allow an owner of the source document to edit objects in each of the multiple documents after the source document has been published (*Users can then create a new Case from a template, the Case is created with the specified properties, Objectives, Case Items, and Search Items from the template. However, user can then modify these, adding, editing, or removing elements except the 'Case categories' attribute, which can only be edited by the owner of the template*, [Column 37, Lines 49-55]).

Regarding **claim 42**, <u>Ainsbury</u> further discloses responsive to a selection by an owner of the source document, enforce a right of the owner to require a user to include and retain contents of the source document in each of the multiple documents, the computer-based document management module adapted to allow the user to append an additional object into each of the multiple documents (*Users can then create a new Case from a template, the Case is created with the specified properties, Objectives, Case Items, and Search Items from the template. However, user can then modify these,*

adding, editing, or removing elements except the 'Case categories' attribute, which can

only be edited by the owner of the template, [Column 37, Lines 49-55]).

Regarding **claim 45**, <u>Ainsbury</u> further discloses the database contains a table

that links a content identifier to an identifier of a container object of the source

document. (*One of the primary functions of the Parsing Kernal (PK) is to read the*

source document and determine the page geometry. This geometry subdivides a

document into the elements shows in Table 30. This table shows the 'Link' element

which indicates an HREF to another document, or another part of this document,

[Column 48, Line 40 -- Column 49, Line 25]).

13.   **Claim 43** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Schneid</u>

(*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of <u>Stefik et al.</u> (*Pub.*

No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter <u>Stefik</u>), and further in

view of <u>Berg et al.</u> (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed on May 31, 2001; hereinafter*

<u>Berg</u>), and further in view of <u>Drucker et al.</u> (*Pub. No. US 2004/0215657, filed on April*

22, 2003, hereinafter <u>Drucker</u>).

Regarding **claim 43**, <u>Schneid</u>, as modified by <u>Stefik</u> and <u>Berg</u>, does not disclose

performing an Edition query that uses a Shell relationship to identify all other Editions in

a Shell of Editions returned in the database query.

However, <u>Drucker</u> further discloses responsive to initiation of a search by a user,

perform a database query, and responsive to a determination that the database query

has returned data, the computer-based document management module adapted to

perform an Edition query that uses a Shell relationship to identify all other Editions in a

Shell of Editions returned in the database query (*the center object 520 on display can result from a user-based search that is narrow or broad wherein either search comprises inputting or selecting one or more metadata terms (e.g., attribute(s)) to facilitate accessing and browsing one or more desired objects. For example, an input component 540 receives a* search request for a journal article *entitled Banana Crops: The Next Generation written by Jane Smith on Jul. 7, 2002. One or more databases (not shown) can be accessed during such a search. The search can result in the center object being the front page of such article. Alternatively, a* search request for attributes such as journal articles *on the topic of genetically modified fruit written in July 2002 can yield a similar result. This similar result is based at least in part upon whether the metadata attached to such article has the strongest and/or closest* match to the metadata/*attributes contained in the search request*, [0061]).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Drucker with the teachings of Schneid, as modified by Stefik and Berg, for the purpose of accessing and browsing objects in which a user begins with a center object (e.g., one or a few focal objects) displayed on a screen and related objects are populated on the screen as well. The related objects can be further organized into clusters whereby each cluster or grouping of objects expands on a particular attribute of the center object, ([Abstract] of Drucker).

14.   **Claims 47-48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Stefik et al. (*Pub. No. 2002/0128856, published on September 12, 2002; hereinafter Stefik*), and

further in view of <u>Berg et al.</u> (*Pub. No. US 2002/0184264. filed on May 31, 2001;*

hereinafter <u>Berg</u>), and further in view of <u>Hartrick et al.</u> (*Pat. No. US 5,428,529, published*

on June 27, 1995; hereinafter <u>Hartrick</u>).

Regarding **claim 47**, <u>Schneid</u>, as modified by <u>Stefik</u> and <u>Berg</u>, does not explicitly

disclose a disclaimer to be printed in a front and back cover of each copy of each

edition comprising the non-public permission, the disclaimer stating that the edition has

been created for private, non-public distribution.

However, <u>Hartrick</u> discloses a disclaimer to be printed in a front and back cover

of each copy of each edition comprising the non-public permission, the disclaimer

stating that the edition has been created for private, non-public distribution (*Figure 9*

shows a process of presenting copyright notices on each and every page of a

document. Step 304 interrogates the default parameter table 56 to determine if there is

a special copyright element with a flag bit on in column 62. Then step 310 determines

whether the copyright notice is to be printed on all pages. If it is, then step 312 will print

the copyright notice string on all pages. The process then flows to step 314 where it is

determined whether a security label is to be printed, by determining the presence of a

corresponding flag bit in column 62 of table 56. Then step 318 determines whether the

security label is to be printed on every page of the document, [Column 10, Line 37 →

Column 11, Line 13]). *Examples of special security string could be "Company*

Confidential" label, [Column 4, Lines 1-3]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of <u>Hartrick</u> with the teachings of

Schneid , as modified by Stefik and Berg, for the purpose of managing the display or the printing of a copyright notice or security label for a soft copy document, so as to provide appropriate security for the document as desired by its author ([Abstract] of Hartrick).

Regarding **claim 48**, Hartrick further discloses the noncommercial permission causes a disclaimer to be printed in a front and back cover of each copy of each edition comprising the noncommercial permission, the disclaimer stating that the edition has been created for noncommercial distribution (*Figure 8C shows the restriction requirement can be displayed on all pages along with security labels also on all pages of a document. Note that restriction elements can be for example, a limited rights notice which the author wishes to place in his documentation*, [Column 9, Lines 63-65]).

Conclusion

15.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

16.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Examiner should be directed to Son T. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 270-

1752. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:30 AM – 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's

supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have

questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Son T Hoang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2165
December 10, 2008

/S. P./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164
/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165